

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/801,675	03/17/2004	Mitsuyuki Nakamura	73478/03	3325
21254	7590 09/30/2005	•	EXAMINER	
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP, PLLC			NGUYEN, HOANG V	
8321 OLD (COURTHOUSE ROAD			
SUITE 200			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
VIENNA, V	VA 22182-3817		2821	
			DATE MAILED: 09/30/200	ς.

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			מית			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/801,675	NAKAMURA, MITSUYUKI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
·	Hoang V. Nguyen	2821				
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wi	th the correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the meanned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNION (1.136(a)). In no event, however, may a residual indication will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON atute, cause the application to become AB	CATION. eply be timely filed THS from the mailing date of this communication. ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _						
;-						
 Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the practice. 						
closed in accordance with the practice unde	el Ex parte Quayle, 1905 C.D	. 11, 400 O.G. 210.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the applicat	ion.	•				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are without	drawn from consideration.	•				
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4,9-12,17,19 and 20</u> is/are allow	red.					
6) Claim(s) <u>5</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) <u>6-8,13-16 and 18</u> is/are objected to						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	•				
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	accepted or b) objected to	by the Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).				
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in A	pplication No				
Copies of the certified copies of the p	•	received in this National Stage				
application from the International But						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not	received.				
Attachment(s)	"□	(DTO 442)				
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date				
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB. Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/12/05</u>. 		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 2821

Response to Arguments

- 1. Applicant's arguments filed on 18 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 2. In response to applicant's arguments, the recitation "of transmission type" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Johnson et al (US 6,844,854 B2).

Johnson (Figures 2 and 5) teaches an antenna device comprising two antenna elements 6 and 8 opposed each other, a signal being fed between the two antenna elements, wherein the two

Art Unit: 2821

antenna elements are spaced apart from each other by a distance smaller than the wavelength of the fed signal (claim 6).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claims 6-8, 13-16 and 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. Claims 1-4, 9-12, 17, 19 and 20 are allowed.
- 7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Regarding claim 1, Hill et al (US 6,104,354) discloses an antenna device comprising two antenna elements 22 and 24 opposed each other, a signal being fed between the two antenna elements; and a variable-capacitance unit 30. Hill, however, fails to specifically teach that the variable-capacitance unit being provided at one or both of connection points at which opposite ends of the two antenna elements are connected to each other.

Claims 2-4, 9-12, 17, 19 and 20 are allowed for depending on claim 1.

Regarding claim 6, Johnson teaches an antenna device comprising two antenna elements opposed each other, a signal being fed between the two antenna elements, wherein the two antenna elements are spaced apart from each other by a distance smaller than the wavelength of the fed signal. Johnson, however, fails to specifically teach that the length of each of the portions of the portions of the two antenna elements on the opposite sides of a feed point is equal to or smaller than ¼ of the wavelength of the fed signal.

Claim 14 would have been found allowable for depending on claim 6.

Art Unit: 2821

Regarding claim 7, Johnson fails to further teach, among other features, a variable-capacitance unit being provided at one or both of connection points at which opposite ends of the antenna elements are connected to each other.

Claims 8, 15 and 16 would have been found allowable for depending on claim 7.

Regarding claim 13, Johnson teaches an antenna device comprising two antenna elements opposed each other, a signal being fed between the two antenna elements, wherein the two antenna elements are spaced apart from each other by a distance smaller than the wavelength of the fed signal. Johnson, however, fails to specifically teach that the antenna device being mounted along peripheral side portions of a frame.

Regarding claim 18, Johnson teaches an antenna device comprising two antenna elements opposed each other, a signal being fed between the two antenna elements, wherein the two antenna elements are spaced apart from each other by a distance smaller than the wavelength of the fed signal. Johnson, however, fails to specifically teach that the two antenna elements form a pair of parallel lines are bent in other than a straight line.

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2821

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang V. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1825. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hoang Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-1825. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hvn 9/27/05

HOANG V. NGUYEN PRIMARY EXAMINER